



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,761	03/06/2002	Tejaswini Hosali	YOR920010756US1	6849

28342 7590 04/04/2005

SAMUEL A. KASSATLY LAW OFFICE  
20690 VIEW OAKS WAY  
SAN JOSE, CA 95120

EXAMINER

ORTIZ, BELIX M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/091,761	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOSALI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Belix M. Ortiz	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-December-2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### Remarks

1. In response to communications files on 22-December-2004, the specification of the disclosure, and claims 1, 4-7, 8, 11-15, and 18-19 are amended per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-19 are presently pending in the application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gusack (U.S. patent 6,112,209).

As to claim 1, Gusack teaches a method for dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases with dissimilar structures (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

linking the two dissimilar databases by means of a pointers database that contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9);

the pointers database receiving instructions external to the at least two dissimilar databases, to effect relationships changes between the at least two dissimilar databases (see

Art Unit: 2164

figures 1-3; column 6, lines 47-52; column 9, lines 37-60; column 25, lines 10-23; and column 31, lines 1-3); and

in response to the external instructions, selectively changing pointers between records in the at least two dissimilar databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40; lines 9-16).

As to claims 2, 9, and 16, Gusack teaches wherein a ratio of the number of records contained in the pointers database to the number of records contained in either one or the at least two dissimilar databases ranges between approximately 0.005% and 5% (see figure 1, it is obvious that the ratio of number of record on the pointer database deemed to include smaller database).

As to claims 3, 10, and 17, Gusack teaches wherein the at least two dissimilar databases include a customer database and an organization database (see figures 1 and 2; column 30, lines 63-67; and column 31, lines 1-3).

As to claims 4, 11, and 18, Gusack teaches the method further comprising:

The pointers database detecting a change to a record in the customer database (see column 3, lines 11-16; column 10, lines 42-51; and column 31, lines 1-3); and

In response to the change to the record in the customer database, selectively changing a pointer in the pointers database, without changing the records in the organization database (see column 14, lines 3-16).

As to claims 5 and 12, Gusack teaches wherein the change to the record in the customer database comprises a change to any one or more of: status change, location, country of residence, importance of business relationship, volume of business, and credit worthiness (see figures 1-4).

As to claims 6, 13, and 19, Gusack teaches the method further comprising:

The pointers database detecting a change to a record in the organization database (see column 30, lines 63-67 and column 31, lines 1-21); and

In response to the change to the record in the customer database, selectively changing a pointer in the pointers database, without changing the records in the customer database (see column 30, lines 63-67 and column 31, lines 1-21).

As to claims 7 and 14, Gusack teaches wherein the change to the record in the organization database comprises a change to any one or more of: organization hierarchy type, branch office, responsibility, and geopolitical status (see column 10, lines 46-51).

As to claim 8, Gusack teaches a computer program for dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases with dissimilar structures (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

a first set of program instructions for linking the two dissimilar databases by means of a pointers database that contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9);

the pointers database receiving instructions external to the at least two dissimilar databases, to effect relationships changes between the at least two dissimilar databases (see figures 1-3; column 6, lines 47-52; column 9, lines 37-60; column 25, lines 10-23; and column 31, lines 1-3); and

a second set of program instructions for changing pointers between records in the at least two dissimilar databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40, lines 9-16).

As to claim 15, Gusack teaches a system for dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases with dissimilar structures (see figures 1, 6, 9 and 23, and column 6, 47-52), comprising:

a pointers database for linking the two dissimilar databases wherein the pointers database contains a smaller number of records than a number of records contained in either one of the at least two dissimilar databases (see figure 9);

the pointers database receiving instructions external to the at least two dissimilar databases, to effect relationships changes between the at least two dissimilar databases (see figures 1-3; column 6, lines 47-52; column 9, lines 37-60; column 25, lines 10-23; and column 31, lines 1-3); and

in response to the external instructions, selectively changing pointers between records in the at least two dissimilar databases by changing records in the pointers database, without changing the records in the at least two dissimilar databases (see column 40, lines 9-16).

*Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed 22-December-2004 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments that "Gusack does not disclose dynamically linking at least two dissimilar databases with dissimilar structures", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Gusack teaches dissimilar databases and dissimilar structures on figures 1-3, 6, and 9-10.

In response to applicants' arguments that "Gusack does not receive instructions external to the two databases o effect relationships changes between these two databases", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Gusack teaches "a further capability provided by the present invention is illustrated in record 402 of said LAT index (2319) wherein said LAF (2323) does not contain an array of linking values but, instead, stores a procedural call to load a separate program called "FilterProgram001.exe". Therefore, pointers to external programs, dynamic link libraries, packages, and other externally compiled object code may be stored and executed in the course of creating data clusters. Finally, although not shown, a person skilled in the art will see that compiled object code, pseudocode (P code), and uncompiled source code may also be stored in said LAF field (2323) or pointed to by the a stored procedural call allowing for the integration of stored procedures

in the data model presented herein”, (see Gusack, column 25, lines 10-23) and also (see Gusack, figures 1-3)

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-4081. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

bmo

March 31, 2005



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**